



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

with the same general period and locality. The Habiru are clearly Aramæan nomads who press continually westward, until in the reign of Ahnaton they occupy the whole of Palestine, from the Phœnician cities in the north to the district around Jerusalem. All this is in striking harmony with the movements of Hebrew tribes as reflected in the patriarchal traditions (pp. 82 ff.). That the main body of the Israelites had no part in the migration to Egypt is borne out by the mention of 'Asaru (the district assigned to the tribe of Asher) among the conquests of Sety I (c. 1313 B.C.), and the inclusion of Israel in the list of peoples subdued by Mineptah (c. 1222 B.C.). It is possible indeed that Israelite families may have participated in the southward movement of Amurru peoples under the Hyksos domination of Egypt, but the migration proper was confined to Joseph tribes, probably during the flourishing period of the Empire (from the reign of Thutmosi III onwards). On this view there is little reason to doubt that Ra'messe II was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and his successor Mineptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The contrasted theory of Mr. H. R. Hall, which connects the Exodus with the expulsion of the Hyksos, and identifies the Habiru aggressions with the conquest of Palestine by Joshua, not merely wrests the witness of the monuments, but "is obliged to do great violence to the Biblical tradition," for it crowds the campaigns of Sety, Ra'messe, and Mineptah into the period of the Judges, and otherwise alters the whole perspective of events (pp. 91 ff.).

ALEX. R. GORDON.

THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

ZOROASTRIANISM AND JUDAISM. GEORGE WILLIAM CARTER, PH.D. The Gorham Press. 1918. Pp. 116. \$2.00.

Judah Ibn Tibbon, one of the most famous translators from the Arabic into Hebrew during the Middle Ages, repeatedly emphasized the fact that to be a good translator one must possess these three qualifications: the mastery of the language from which he translates, the mastery of the language into which he translates, and the mastery of the subject-matter with which his translation deals. Slightly modified, one may apply this characterization to the author on comparative religion. To write intelligently on comparative religion one must master the systems of religion compared and their mutual relation.

The many points of resemblance between Zoroastrianism and Judaism have attracted the attention of the learned world for more

than two centuries. T. H. Hyde in his *Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum*, Oxford, 1700, had not the slightest doubt that Zoroastrianism was a poor copy of Judaism. Abraham is for him the first law-giver of the Persians, and the Messianic hopes found in the Zoroastrian writings are directly dependent upon the Old Testament, "which was well known to Zarathustra"—"quod ei bene notum fuit." One can hardly suppress a smile at his naïveté, but one must not take too seriously the opposite view, which maintains that Judaism borrowed its main religious views from Zoroastrianism.

The author of the present book, though he does not go to the extreme, is nevertheless convinced that "while the germs of the beliefs that came into prominence in post-exilic times in Judaism may be present in the earlier writings, the germs are not enough to explain the later developments." This reads like a compromise between those who deny any essential influence of Zoroastrianism on Judaism and those who make the latter depend on the former. Compromises may solve political and social difficulties, but never a scientific problem. If pre-exilic Judaism contained the germs from which its post-exilic form developed, then why make it dependent on external influences? But if post-exilic Judaism can only be explained as a result of foreign influences, it is no longer a direct development of the pre-exilic religion of Israel. However, be that as it may, the view of Eduard Meyer with regard to the relation of Zoroastrianism to Judaism is the only safe and sane one, at least for the present, while the date of composition of the most important Avesta documents is so uncertain.

The analogies between Judaism and Zoroastrianism, says Eduard Meyer,<sup>1</sup> are very striking, but it would be radically wrong to claim a direct influence of Zoroastrianism on Judaism. What is common to both religions is mainly due to their similar development, and, in some details, to the dependence of both on Babylonian religion. If we disregard Darmesteter's theories concerning the late origin of the Avesta, in which he finds elements borrowed not only from the Bible but also from Philo, the view of Eduard Meyer is shared by the leading authorities on the history of Judaism and Zoroastrianism. I will only mention Söderblom, whose book, *La Vie Future d'après le Mazdéisme* (Paris, 1901), is the most thorough and extensive study on the relation of Judaism to Zoroastrianism, and Schürer, whose *History* is the standard book on the inner life of the Jew at the time of the rise of Christianity. Both of them agree that the influence of Zoroastrianism on Judaism is of a very unessential nature. It is

<sup>1</sup> Die Entstehung des Judentums, p. 239.

therefore very regrettable that Dr. Carter did not follow the safe guidance of these scholars; for, carried away by untenable hypotheses, he gives to the public a very wrong impression of the development of later Judaism.

It would lead me too far to enter into a detailed discussion of this book, and there is no need of this, as there is hardly any material brought forward by the author which has not been thoroughly examined before by others. I shall, however, call attention to the following few facts. The author (p. 24) accepts as historical the tradition found in *Arda Virāf*, 1 2, according to which Zarathustra lived about three hundred years before the invasion of Alexander the Great — not before the time of Alexander, as the author has it. He maintains that this view is also in harmony with the most recent scholarship. But the testimony of Assyrian inscriptions finally disposes of this tradition. An inscription of the year 713 B.C. mentions the name “*Miazdaka*,” and, as pointed out by Eduard Meyer, this shows that the Zoroastrian religion must even then have been predominant in Media. The author (p. 26) takes also as historical the legend about Zarathustra at the court of Vishtaspa. But the King Vishtaspa has no place in historical chronology. The legend undoubtedly thought of Hystaspes, the father of Darius I, and in true legendary style Hutaosa is given as the name of Vishtaspa’s wife — a reminiscence of Atossa, the wife of Cambyses. The author shows a good deal of naïveté in his remark (p. 39) that post-exilic Judaism could not have been influenced by the Babylonians, because “the Babylonians were too gross in their idolatry to develop Jewish religious conceptions.” One does not need to be an adherent of Pan-Babylonianism to see the absurdity of such a statement. That one who is not cognizant of the great influence which Babylonian religion has exercised upon Judaism does not take into account the contact between Aryan and Semito-Hittite religion, is of course not surprising. For our author, the seven archangels forming the heavenly hierarchy, according to later Jewish writings, are directly borrowed from Zoroastrianism (p. 65). But the truth is that the number seven has no special meaning with the Aryans, while it plays a very important part in the religious conception of the Babylonians. There can therefore be no reasonable doubt that the *seven* Amesha Spenta of Zoroastrianism, as well as the seven archangels of later Judaism, have their archetype either in the seven planets of the Babylonian cosmology or in the “*ilâni-sibit* of the Babylonians.” This is no longer a hypothesis but an assured fact, as can be seen from the list of Assyrian gods published by Scheil (*R. T.* r *xiv*, 100), in which we

find Assara Mazdas (=Ahurah Mazdah) immediately followed by the seven spirits of heaven, the Igigi, and the seven spirits of earth, the Anunaki. That Asmodeus is not, as the author maintains (p. 65), of Persian origin, but is good Aramaic, I think to have conclusively shown in the Jewish Encyclopedia, s.u. *Asmodeus*. In this connection I may be permitted to call attention to my essay, *Mabbul Shel Esh*, published in the Hebrew periodical *Hag-Goren* (Bordetschan, 1912). In this essay I have shown that the conception of the conflagration of the world, which plays such an important part in the eschatology of Zoroastrianism and which is also known to the Jews and Greeks, is of Babylonian origin.

LOUIS GINZBERG.

THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA.

CHRISTIAN BELIEF IN GOD. A German Criticism of German Materialistic Philosophy. GEORG WOBBERMIN. Translated by DANIEL S. ROBINSON (Third German edition). Yale University Press. 1918. Pp. xx, 175. \$1.25.

This work has been well known and highly appreciated for several years by those who have read it in German. It is now made available to English readers in an excellent translation, and such readers will be well rewarded by its perusal. It is a brief book, in which the author sketches in large outline, and stresses the significant features of the Christian faith in its relation to the main currents of modern thought. He deals in the first chapter with the chief tendencies of present-day philosophy; in the second with epistemology; in the third with cosmology; in the fourth with biology; and in the final chapter with psychology. He shows the bearing of all these philosophical disciplines and their main conclusions on the Christian faith, and the place this faith holds in its own right as a living experience and as throwing light on the problems of philosophy. While the author recognizes the destructive criticism of Kant and the inadequacy of the old scholastic arguments for the existence of God, he holds, nevertheless, that there is need to show the implications of the modern world view, which requires the Christian faith for its best interpretation and justification.

The book is generous in its appreciations, particularly of the religious motive in Nietzsche; keen in its criticism, as in case of Haeckel; spiritual in its conception of the providence of God, as in his abandonment of the miraculous, and vitally religious.

DANIEL EVANS.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.